IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR (C.G.)

M.A. No. 183 /2006 **Single Bench**

APPELLANTS : CLAIMENTS

1. Purnima Bai, Wd/o Ramsharan Manikpuri, Aged about 30 yrs.
2. Ku. Shradhda, D/o Ramsharan Manikpuri, aged about 01 yrs.
3. Ku. Wasini, D/o Ramsharan Manikpuri, aged about 2 month.
4. Chatur Das, S/o Manrakhan Manikpuri, aged about 58 yrs.
5. Hanumat Bai, W/o Chatur Das Manikpuri, aged about 55 yrs.
6. Ku. Shanti, D/o Chatur Das Manikpuri, aged about 20 yrs.
7. Ku. Ganga, D/o Chatur Das Manikpuri, aged about 18 yrs.
8. Ku. Yamuna, D/o Chatur Das Manikpuri, aged about 18 yrs. Appellant nos.2 & 3 & are represented by legal guardian mother Purnima Bai. All R/o Chaparid, P.O. Samoda, P.S. Arang, Distt. Raipur(C.G.)

P.R. No. 2374/06 Presented by Shri S. Sharma dated 21/8/06

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS: NON-APPLICANTS

1. Ramu Ram @ Ravindra Kumar Shrivashtava, S/o Narendra Shrivashtava, R/o Vill. Pandardalli, P.S. Dalli, Distt. Durg(C.G.), Present Address By Jagamatin Bai, W/o Ankalu Ram, S/o Pachapedi Naka Raipur, Distt. Raipur(C.G.)
2. Smt. Jagamatin Bai, W/o Ankalu Ram, R/o Pachapedi Naka Raipur, Distt. Raipur(C.G.)
3. National Insurance Co. Ltd. By Divisional Manager National Insurance Co. Ltd., G.E. Road Raipur, Distt. Raipur(C.G.)
4. Sant Ram Satnami By Naresh Kumar Devangan, S/o Babu Lal Devangan, R/o Post Arang, P.S. & Tah. Arang, Distt. Raipur(C.G.)
5. Santosh Singh, S/o Himmat Singh, R/o Tatibandh, P.S. Amanaka, Distt. Raipur(C.G.)

Miscellaneous Appeal under Section 173 of the Motor Vehicle Act, 1994

XI-HC—78

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

(28)

मामला क्रमांक M.A.CC) 183 सन् 2006

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अंतिम आदेश
	07.05.2007 Heard on I.A.No. 1618/2006, application for condonation of delay in filing this appeal as the same has been filed with a delay of 181 days as per office note dated 23.8.2006. The reasons assigned for condoning the delay are that the appellants were under the impression that the appeal may be filed at any time and they were not having sufficient fund to initiate legal proceedings. The reasons assigned in the application for condonation of delay cannot be considered to be sufficient grounds for condoning the delay. Accordingly, the application for condonation of delay is rejected. Consequently, the appeal is also dismissed as barred by law of limitation. **Sd/-** **Dhirendra Mishra** **Judge**	